# 2005-2006 SES EVALUATION REPORT

## **DEMOGRAPHIC DATA**

PROVIDER NAME: Club Z! Tutoring

DISTRICTS SERVED: Gary Community School Corporation, Anderson Community Schools,

MSD Perry Township, Indianapolis Public Schools, Franklin County

**Community Schools** 

# OF STUDENTS ENROLLED: 698 (Reading), 698 (Math)
# OF STUDENTS COMPLETED: 513 (Reading), 513 (Math)

GRADES: K-12

**TYPE OF DELIVERY:** Individual tutoring/small group instruction

**DESCRIPTION:** See http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/dg/ses/detail-vendor2.cfm?recordID=0016

STUDENT/TEACHER

**RATIO:** 1/1 or 2-8/1 for small group instruction

## **CUSTOMER SATISFACTION**

#### PARENT REPORT

% of parents reporting: 9.55%

Overall score: 3.36/4.0

DISTRICT REPORT

% of districts served reporting: 100% (5/5)

District recommends continuation?: Y (4/5 districts served)

N (1/5 districts served)

PRINCIPAL REPORT

% of principals reporting: 35%

Overall Score: 2.21/4.0

CUSTOMER SATISFACTION GRADE: B

## **SERVICE DELIVERY**

## PARENT REPORT

% of parents reporting: 9.55%

Overall score: 3.16/4.0

**DISTRICT REPORT:** 

% of districts reporting: 100% (5/5)

Overall score: 83.33% (70/84 possible points)

PRINCIPAL REPORT:

% of principals reporting: 35%

Overall score: 2.73/4.0

**ONSITE MONITORING/COMPLIANCE:** 4.0/4.0

**SERVICE DELIVERY GRADE:**  $\mathbf{B}$ +

ACADEMIC EFFECTIVENESS

**COMPLETION RATE:** 73.50%

% OF STUDENTS MEETING GOALS

(OF THOSE WHO COMPLETED): 82.65% (Language)

84.99% (Math)

TYPE OF ASSESSMENT USED BY PROVIDER: KTEA Assessment: Standards-based Assessment

% OF STUDENTS SHOWING GAINS 95.62% (Language); 96.63% (Math);

(BASED ON 100% SAMPLE REPORTED):

**AVERAGE GAIN:** +16.08 (standards-based Math); +1.1 (KTEA Math)

+14.97 (standards-based LA); +1.9 (KTEA LA)

% CHANGE IN PRE/POST ASSESSMENT: +40.79% (standards-based Math); +34.47% (KTEA Math)

+37.45% (standards-based LA); +56.62% (KTEA LA)

% OF STUDENTS WHO ATTENDED

80% OR MORE SESSIONS: 100%

ISTEP+ DATA (included in academic effectiveness grade):

For each provider, the ISTEP+ scale scores for each student who participated in SES were analyzed for 2005 and 2006 in English/Language Arts and Math. Only students who completed 80% of their programs and had ISTEP+ scores for both years were included in the analysis.

# OF STUDENTS COMPLETING 80% OR MORE SESSIONS:

493

(only students completing 80% of provider sessions are included in this analysis)

#### SES STUDENTS ONLY: ISTEP+ RESULTS

For the students served by Club Z in 2005-2006 who met the criteria described above, ISTEP+ scores grew an average of 18 points for Mathematics and 7 points for English/Language Arts. 65% showed any growth in Mathematics, and 60% showed any growth in English/Language Arts. 38% of the students served showed one year's worth of growth on ISTEP+ scale score for Mathematics, compared to 41% for English/Language Arts. The percentage of students passing ISTEP+ in Mathematics declined by 3 percentage points, while the percentage passing ISTEP+ in English/Language Arts declined by 8.

#### # OF STUDENTS: 256

(of students completing 80% of the sessions, only those having ISTEP+ scores for both 2005 and 2006 were included in this analysis)

CHANGE:	+17.6 (Math)	+6.9 (E/LA)
CHANGE.	$\pm 1/.0$ (Mau)	$TU \cdot J \cdot LL / LL \cap I$

% SHOWING GROWTH ON

**ISTEP+ SCALE SCORE:** 65% (Math) 60% (E/LA)

% SHOWING 1 YEAR'S

**GROWTH ON ISTEP**+ 38% (Math) 41% (E/LA)

**SCALE SCORE**:

**% PASSING ISTEP+ (2005):** 45% (Math) 40% (E/LA)

% **PASSING ISTEP+ (2006):** 42% (Math) 32% (E/LA)

## SES AND NON-SES STUDENTS MATCHED: ISTEP+ RESULTS

## **MATHEMATICS**

Where possible, each student who participated in SES was matched with a similar student who did not participate in SES. SES students were matched with other students from their school on a number of characteristics, including grade in school, race, free/reduced lunch eligibility, special education status, limited English proficiency, and 2005 ISTEP+ scale score. The chart below provides the results of the match comparison that demonstrates how the ISTEP+ scores and scale score growth of students who participated in SES compare to similar students who did not participate in SES. For Club Z, 169 matches out of 256 eligible students (66%) were found for Mathematics. For the group who participated in SES, 65% showed any growth on ISTEP+; a slightly greater percentage (66%) of non-participating students showed any growth. However, 43% of the students who participated in SES showed one year's growth on ISTEP+, compared to 40% of the students who did not participate. The SES group's average ISTEP+ score grew by 19 points, while the non-participating matched group's average ISTEP+ score grew by 16 points.

MATHEMATICS							
Students	# Matched	% Matched	% showing growth	% showing 1 year's growth	Average growth	% passing (2006)	
SES	169	66.0%	65%	43%	19	37%	
Non-SES	169	66.0%	66%	40%	16	40%	

#### ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS

Where possible, each student who participated in SES was matched with a similar student who did not participate in SES. SES students were matched with other students from their school on a number of characteristics, including grade in school, race, free/reduced lunch eligibility, special education status, limited English proficiency, and 2005 ISTEP+ scale score. The chart below provides the results of the match comparison that demonstrates how the ISTEP+ scores and scale score growth of students who participated in SES compare to similar students who did not participate in SES. For Club Z, 188 matches out of 256 eligible students (73%) were found for English/Language Arts. For the group who participated in SES, 61% showed any growth on ISTEP+, compared to 55% of the non-participating group. 41% of the students who participated in SES showed one year's growth on ISTEP+, compared to a slightly lower percentage (40%) of the students who did not participate in SES. The SES group's average ISTEP+ score grew by 6 points, while the non-participating matched group's average ISTEP+ score also grew by 6 points.

ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS								
Students	# Matched	% Matched	% showing growth	% showing 1 year's growth	Average growth	% passing (2006)		
SES	188	73.4%	61%	41%	6	28%		
Non-SES	188	73.4%	55%	40%	6	35%		

**ACADEMIC EFFECTIVENESS GRADE:** 

**B**-

**OVERALL GRADE:** B